

REMARKS

Claims 8-26 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-7 have been cancelled herein. New claims 21-26 have been added for substantive examination. The Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

The Applicants have cancelled claims 1-7 and provide new claims 21-26 for substantive examination. The Applicants respectfully submit that new claim 21 has been written to identify positively recited elements that should be given patentable weight. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the § 112 rejections to claims 1-7 are moot and withdrawal is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis (US 3,370,477) in view of Baasch et al. (US 2002/0062706). Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (US 6,619,153) in view of Lewis (US 3,370,477).

Claims 1-3 have been cancelled. Accordingly, the § 103 is now moot and withdrawal is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claims 4-7 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating the allowable subject matter. The Applicants have provided new claims 21-26 corresponding to originally filed claims 4-7. Claim 21 includes the positively recited elements of claim 4 and the intervening claims that render new claim 21 as novel and not obvious. Claims 22-26 depend therefrom. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to pass new claims 21-26 to allowance.

PREVIOUSLY PROVIDED SECOND PRELIMINARY AMENDMENT

The Applicants respectfully point the Examiner's attention to a Second Preliminary Amendment that was submitted on October 16, 2007. In this Amendment, claims 8-20 were added for substantive examination. The Applicants respectfully request examination of claims 8-20 at this time.

It should be appreciated that the Applicants have not provided claims 8-20 in response to the presently pending Office Action. These claims were provided over one year before the mailing of the present Office Action.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. The Applicants therefore respectfully

request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1222.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 22, 2009

By: /Donald G. Walker/
Donald G. Walker, Reg. No. 44,390

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

DGW/jmm

14475381.1